

Virginia Division of Consolidated Laboratory Services

| Nitrate-Nitrite Nitrogen by Automated Colorimetry EPA Method 353.2 Revision 2.0 | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---|---|-----|----------|
| Facility Name: _____ VELAP ID _____ | | | | | |
| Assessor Name: _____ Analyst Name: _____ Inspection Date _____ | | | | | |
| Relevant Aspect of Standards | Method Reference | Y | N | N/A | Comments |
| Records Examined: SOP Number/ Revision/ Date _____ Analyst: _____ | | | | | |
| Sample ID: _____ Date of Sample Preparation: _____ Date of Analysis: _____ | | | | | |
| Were samples collected in thoroughly cleaned plastic or glass bottles? | 8.1 | | | | |
| Were samples preserved with sulfuric acid to a pH of <2 and cooled to 4°C at the time of collection? | 8.2 | | | | |
| If samples were not analyzed as soon as possible after collection were they maintained at 4°C for no longer than 28 days? | 8.3 | | | | |
| Were samples to be analyzed for nitrate or nitrite only analyzed within 48 hours? | 8.4 | | | | |
| Were LCR, MDLs, and QCS measured prior to performing any sample analysis by this method? | 9.2.1 | | | | |
| Were LCRs determined initially, every 6 months, or whenever as significant instrument change is observed? | 9.2.2 | | | | |
| Were verifications of linearity done with a blank and a minimum of three standards and shown to be within ±10% of initial values? | 9.2.2 | | | | |
| If any portions of the linear calibration range was shown to be nonlinear during verifications, were those nonlinear portions clearly defined by sufficient standards? | 9.2.2 | | | | |
| Were QCS analyzed initially (prior to MDL determination) and quarterly thereafter and determined to be ±10% of stated values? | 9.2.3 | | | | |
| Were MDLs determined for all analytes initially and every six months thereafter? | 9.2.4 | | | | |
| Notes/Comments: | | | | | |

Virginia Division of Consolidated Laboratory Services

| Nitrate-Nitrite Nitrogen by Automated Colorimetry EPA Method 353.2 Revision 2.0 | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---|---|-----|----------|
| Relevant Aspect of Standards | Method Reference | Y | N | N/A | Comments |
| Was at least one LRB analyzed with each batch of samples? | 9.3.1 | | | | |
| Was at least one LFB analyzed with each batch of samples and determined to be within 90-110% recovery or within ± 3 standard deviations of mean percent recovery, whichever is better? | 9.3.2 | | | | |
| Were Instrument Performance Checks (IPCs) consisting of mid-range check standards analyzed following daily calibration, every tenth sample, and at the end of the each run and determined to be $\pm 10\%$ of calibration? | 9.3.4 | | | | |
| Were known amounts added to duplicate aliquots of a minimum of 10% of routine samples for LFM analysis? | 9.4.1 | | | | |
| Were LFMs determined to have percent recoveries between 90-110%? | 9.4.2 | | | | |
| Were LFM measurements outside of 90-110% determined to be matrix related rather than system related? | 9.4.3 | | | | |
| Were samples adjusted to have pHs of between 5 and 9 with hydrochloric acid or ammonium hydroxide? | 11.1 | | | | |
| Were samples that exceeded the highest calibration standard diluted, and only values that fell between the highest and lowest calibration standards reported? | 12.2 | | | | |
| Were results reported in mg/L? | 12.3 | | | | |
| Notes/Comments: | | | | | |